

Although the remedy selected in the 1993 ROD would have been effective in the short term, it could not be implemented because no acceptable reprocessing facility could be located. Site conditions changed and a time-critical removal action was warranted to address the immediate Site risks to human health and the environment.

- **Implementability** - Under the Implementability criterion, EPA considers the technical and administrative feasibility of implementing a cleanup alternative such as relative availability of goods and services. This criterion is not applicable to the no-further-action alternative because no new remedial actions will be implemented under the no further action remedy. The reprocessing component of the remedy selected in the 1993 ROD was considered to be implementable because favorable responses indicating interest from reprocessing facilities were received during the public comment period for the 1993 ROD. As the initial step toward implementing the remedy selected in the 1993 ROD, the participating companies solicited bids from ore processing facilities. No ore processing facilities which were technically capable of reprocessing the contaminated material from the Site would accept the contaminated materials under conditions which were acceptable to the EPA. Since an acceptable reprocessor could not be located, the original remedy could not be implemented as selected. Site conditions changed due to heavy rains and the time-critical removal action was warranted.

Ground water and surface water monitoring, operation and maintenance, and continued implementation of institutional controls, as required by the 1993 ROD, and as explained in this ROD Amendment, were recognized as implementable in the 1993 ROD, and these elements of the proposed alternative remain implementable.

- **Cost** - Under the Cost criterion, EPA considers the cost of implementing a cleanup alternative including the estimated capital and operation and maintenance costs as well as present worth costs. Although the remedy selected in the 1993 ROD would have been cost effective, it could not be implemented because no acceptable reprocessing facility could be located. Site conditions changed, and a time-critical removal action was warranted to address the threats to human health and the environment. Currently, all waste material at the Site has been neutralized with limestone and disposed of in a capped cell. Erosion controls, including revegetation and engineering controls, have been instituted at all affected Site areas. These activities were completed during the time-critical removal action and will be monitored during the O&M phase to ensure their effectiveness.

Ground water and surface water monitoring, operation and maintenance, and continued implementation of institutional controls, as required by the 1993 ROD and explained in this ROD Amendment, will be conducted under the proposed no-further-action alternative in order to verify that no unacceptable exposure to potential hazards posed by conditions at the Site occurs in the future. There will be a minimal cost increase for the O&M for the no-further-action remedy compared to the O&M costs estimated in the 1993 ROD. The increase in O&M costs is due to the added costs of O&M for the disposal cell. Because the cell has been seeded and engineering controls are already in place, and because the ground water monitoring wells were

installed prior to placement of the cell, this O&M cost increase is expected to be a negligible percentage of the original O&M cost estimate.

- **State/Support Agency Acceptance** - Under the State/Support Agency Acceptance criterion, EPA considers the State's position and key concerns related to EPA's preferred remedial alternative and the other alternatives described in the Proposed Plan, and also considers State comments on ARARs or the proposed use of waivers. The State of New Mexico supported the remedy selected in the 1993 ROD, and the State also supported the need for a time-critical removal action. The State agreed that the ARARs were properly identified in the 1993 ROD, and the State also agreed that the ARARs were properly identified in the Action Memorandum. The State also supports this ROD Amendment. See the Support Agency Comments section of this document.
- **Community Acceptance** - Under the community acceptance criterion, EPA determines which components of the remedial alternatives identified in the Proposed Plan interested persons in the community support, have reservations about, or oppose. Comments received on the Proposed Plan are an important indicator of community acceptance. The community participated in interviews and an open house and supplied the EPA with comments on the remedy selected in the 1993 ROD. The EPA has kept the community informed of Site activities through public open house meetings. Public comment on the time-critical removal action was solicited during a public open house meeting prior to finalization of the Action Memorandum. A formal public meeting was held on June 9, 1999. The public supported the removal action, and the public does not have any concerns about implementation of the no-further-action alternative. Please see the Public Participation Activities section of this document for additional detail regarding public involvement.

**SUPPORT AGENCY COMMENTS**

The NMED has reviewed this ROD Amendment. The State's support for this ROD is documented in Appendix A.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES**

Community relations activities have been conducted at the Site in support of the remedial action since 1991. The public participation requirements of CERCLA, Subsection 113(k)(2)(B)(i-v) and CERCLA Section 117, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9613(k)(2)(B)(i-v) and 9617, were met during the initial remedial action decision-making process which culminated in an April 27, 1993, public meeting in Silver City to announce proposed response action alternatives and to solicit public comment. Public comment was incorporated into the selected remedy which was memorialized in the 1993 ROD. On June 3, 1997, EPA held a public open house meeting to announce the proposed Removal Action. Verbal and written public reaction to the announcement was overwhelmingly positive. On October 6, 1997, an informational meeting to advise the public of the initiation of construction at the Site was held.

An Amended Proposed Plan recommending that the 1993 ROD remedy be amended to "no-further-action" was mailed to the individuals whose names appear on the Site mailing list in May 1999. On May 23, 1999, a notice was published in the Silver City Sun News that the Administrative Record File was available for public review and comment. A public meeting was held in Silver City on June 9, 1999, to explain the change to the remedy, to answer questions, and to solicit comments from community members. Also, a 30-day written public comment period from, May 26, 1999, through June 25, 1999, was provided. There were no public comments which specifically addressed the change in the remedy proposed by the May 26, 1999, Amended Proposed Plan. Based on the overwhelmingly positive public response to the proposed removal action, the successful completion of that action, and the lack of negative response to the May 26, 1999, Amended Proposed Plan, it is clear that the change in the remedy is supported by the interested public. Several comments were received which pertained to O&M of the remedy. These comments are addressed in Appendix B, the Responsiveness Summary.

### **STATUTORY DETERMINATION**

Because this remedy will result in hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants remaining on-site above levels that allow for unlimited use and unrestricted exposure, the first statutory review will be conducted within five years after initiation of the response action (i.e., by September 2002) and every five years thereafter to ensure that the remedy is protective of human health and the environment.

**APPENDIX A:  
STATE LETTER OF CONCURRENCE**

000154



State of New Mexico  
**ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT**

Ground Water Quality Bureau  
Harold Runnels Building  
1190 St. Francis Drive, P.O. Box 26110  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502

(505) 827-2918 phone  
(505) 827-2965 fax



**PETER MAGGIORE**  
Secretary

**GARY E. JOHNSON**  
GOVERNOR

**PAUL RITZMA**  
Deputy Secretary

September 9, 1999

Myron O. Knudsen, P.E.  
Director  
Superfund Division  
U.S. EPA, Region VI  
1445 Ross Ave.  
Dallas, Texas 75202-2733

RECEIVED  
SEP 13 1999  
SUPERFUND DIV  
U.S. EPA REGION VI

**RE: Amended ROD for the Cleveland Mill Site near Silver City, New Mexico  
CERCLIS ID No.: NMD981155930**

Dear Mr. Knudsen:

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with the written concurrence you requested from the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) for the Amended ROD for the Cleveland Mill site near Silver City, New Mexico. NMED has reviewed the Amendment to the Record of Decision prepared by EPA in August 1999. NMED agrees with the no further action conclusion of the document for this site based on the results of the removal action performed over the past year by the Responsible Parties. It is understood by NMED that the continuation of ground water and surface water monitoring, operation and maintenance of the constructed cap, and implementation of institutional controls will all be required for proper site closure.

NMED appreciates the coordination efforts put forth by EPA to reach a successful conclusion to remedial activities at the Cleveland Mill site. If you have any questions regarding this site, please contact me at (505) 827-1758 or Robert King at (505) 827-0078.

Sincerely, 

Greg Lewis  
Director  
Water and Waste Management Division

GL:rk

cc: Peter Maggioro, NMED  
Maura Hanning, NMED  
Kathleen Aisling, USEPA

000155

**APPENDIX B:  
RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY**

000156

12.36.36

**Cleveland Mill Superfund Site  
Amended Record of Decision  
Responsiveness Summary**

000157

**Vegetation**

- 1) What is the status of the reseeded efforts at the Site?

The disturbed areas of the Site were seeded using hydromulch in the fall of 1998. Hydromulching is a method whereby seeds are mixed with fertilizer, mulch, and water and broadcast over an area. Once dry, the mulch forms a webbing that holds the seeds in place and protects the seeds from animals until the seeds can germinate. The seed mixture used at the Site was a mixture of seeds that germinate in different seasons. Most of the varieties are drought resistant.

At the time of the Amended Record of Decision Proposed Plan public meeting in June 1999, the seeds had not yet germinated because of the lack of rain in the area. Since that time, many of the grasses have sprouted in the disposal cell, mill, and mine areas as a result of the seasonal monsoonal rains.

The participating companies, with the oversight of the EPA and NMED, will continue to inspect the Site vegetation on a regular basis in accordance with the Site Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan. Revegetation, along with other engineering controls, is intended to control erosion at the Site, and its success will be judged on that basis. The cap and excavated areas will be inspected so that, if obvious areas of erosion exist, they can be repaired. Repairs may include terracing and other engineering controls designed to prevent erosion. Runoff from the Site will be measured to ensure that Site-produced sediment does not cause problems in Little Walnut Creek or other surface water bodies.

**Future Use of the Site**

- 2) What will be the future use of the Site and how will future owners of the Site be notified of the history of the Site?

The Site and many acres of property adjacent to the Site are owned by one or more of the participating companies. The disposal cell and the ground water in the mill area will continue to have land use restrictions. These land use restrictions are called restrictive covenants, and notices describing these covenants have been recorded as part of the permanent land title record. The restrictive covenants will limit activities at the disposal

cell so that the protective cap that covers the cell will remain intact and continue to act as a barrier that prevents rainwater from infiltrating the treated waste material. The ground water restrictions will limit use of the mill area ground water if it is found to contain concentrations of contaminants that exceed drinking water standards.

Ground water quality is checked by testing the quality of water in monitoring wells on the Site. The original monitoring well that was located at the toe of the large tailings pile in the mill area was demolished so that it would not interfere with the excavation of the tailings. A new well, installed in the same area, has not produced sufficient water for sampling. Consequently, the quality of the ground water in the mill area is not known at this time.

Except for the disposal cell area and the restricted mill area ground water, the Site was cleaned up to residential standards and is available for reuse. The participating companies have stated that they have no immediate plans to sell or develop the Site, but that in the future they might sell the land to a developer. Future purchasers of the Site will discover the Site ownership history, including the restrictive covenants, when deed records are examined during the title search that typically accompanies land sales. Moreover, companies that finance land development generally undertake a study known as a Phase I Environmental Investigation, and such studies specifically search for notices like the restrictive covenants that have been placed on the Site.

#### **Records in the Silver City Public Library**

- 3) The library does not have enough space to continue storing all the public records for the Site.

EPA has been in contact with the reference librarian at the Silver City Public Library. By the fall of 1999, EPA will replace the paper administrative record file with a CD-ROM version.

#### **Ground Water and Surface Water**

- 4) What is the quality of the ground water and the surface water in the area?

The participating companies (with oversight from EPA and NMED) have been sampling approximately eight to ten ground water wells in the area on a quarterly basis since mid-1997. These wells have included on-site wells as well as residential wells. Some of the residential wells sampled are located at the nearest residence south of the Site. Wells south of the Site were selected because the tailings have generally moved to the south down Little Walnut Creek. Other residential wells located at the confluence of Little Walnut Creek and Picnic Creek were also sampled because most of the tailings that were

transported in runoff settled upstream of the confluence of the two creeks. The residential wells have met and continue to meet health-based standards. The Site monitoring wells have also continued to meet standards. The participating companies will continue to monitor the wells in the monitoring network (including the residential wells) in accordance with the Site ground water sampling and analysis plan. At this point in the project, the schedule specifies quarterly monitoring.

As previously stated in this responsiveness summary, the replacement well for the mill area well that was sampled during the remedial investigation has not produced enough water for sampling to take place. The water quality in the original well, located at the toe of the tailings, and most likely, in a perched water zone within the tailings, did not meet ground water standards. The participating companies will continue to try to sample the replacement well in accordance with the ground water sampling and analysis plan. Institutional controls restricting the use of ground water in the mill area will remain in effect.

Concentrations of metals in the surface water have remained relatively constant over time. Now that the tailings removal is complete and erosion controls are in place, Site-related impacts on surface water should be minimal. The surface water will continue to be monitored on a regular basis. At this point in the project, the schedule specifies quarterly monitoring.

- 5) What about the ground water of the residents living downhill of the north-northwestern side of the disposal cell in the Web Gulch Area? Will these residents have their wells tested? There is a possibility of these residential wells being affected if the cell fails from ground water flow through fractured bedrock. Also, the wells ringing the disposal cell are too close to the treated waste material to detect a leak in the cell.

Since receiving this comment, EPA directed the participating companies to do a survey in the Web Gulch area to see if a residential well could be found to sample. EPA's intention was to determine the current condition of well water in the Web Gulch Area (current condition is referred to as the "baseline"), so that in the future, well results could be compared to this baseline to determine if any changes occurred and if the changes were caused by a leak in the disposal cell. The commenter does not yet have a well, so the participating companies asked other residents if their wells could be used to establish a baseline. These other residents either could not be contacted or would not give the participating companies permission to sample their wells.

There is very little chance that the wells in the Web Gulch Area will be impacted by contaminants from the Site. These wells are safe from Site contaminants because the containment cell that is storing the contaminants has redundant safeguards. These safeguards make it very unlikely that contaminants could escape, because the geology of the cell is such that it will not allow contaminants to escape, and because a continuous

ground water pathway between the cell and the residential wells in Web Gulch most likely does not exist. These reasons are detailed below:

- a) The cell was constructed with several redundant safeguard containment features designed to prevent contaminants from escaping. These containment features include the admixing of limestone to neutralize acidic Site tailings and sediment in order to prevent acidic leachate generation. The quantity of limestone used is far greater than was necessary to neutralize any Site tailings and sediment. The cap that was placed on top of the cell is another containment feature. The cap is ten to fifteen feet thick which is eight to thirteen feet thicker than called for in the original design. The cap as designed included a 12 inch bedding layer of crushed excavated rock (3/4") overlain by 20 mil PVC liner. A 12 inch protective layer was placed on top of the liner. The protective layer consisted of crushed excavated rock (3/4" minus). It was overlain by a 10 -15 foot cover of random fill (nominal 12" minus.) The top of the cover was seeded. The cap will greatly reduce the possibility of surface runoff and precipitation coming into contact with the Site waste material.
  - b) The geology of the cell was thoroughly mapped and analyzed. Although there were fractures present, these fractures were filled with carbonate minerals and did not appear to have a high permeability. This low permeability means that it is unlikely that the fractures will act as a preferential pathway for ground water. In addition, the cell was placed about 25 feet above the seasonal high ground water table. Since there is not an obvious preferential pathway for the ground water through the cell, the monitoring wells were placed close to the cell, the appropriate location to detect contamination.
  - c) The ground water pathway in fractured bedrock is discontinuous. The vertical separation between the cell monitoring wells, about 70 feet deep, and the residential wells, in the range of 200-300 feet deep, is hundreds of feet. In addition, the residential wells are located approximately one mile away horizontally. It is unlikely that the metals from the cell could leach from the tailings and migrate in the ground water through the discontinuous series of fractures over such large distances and depths to a residential well screen.
- 6) One commenter was concerned that the surface water downhill from the disposal cell could be affected by runoff from the containment cell. The commenter asked what EPA planned to do about erosion control.

While designing the disposal cell, EPA, NMED, and the participating companies considered the possibility that the clean cap material might erode. The cell was designed and constructed to minimize erosion. An erosion resistant bedrock lip was left around the cell during construction. Grasses planted on the cell will also serve to inhibit erosion. The Site O&M Plan includes inspection of the cell on a regular basis and more often when heavy rains fall. EPA believes that these engineering controls and

inspections will minimize the chance that erosion will have an impact on the surface water in the Site area. As stated above, runoff from the Site will be measured to ensure that Site-produced sediment does not cause problems in Little Walnut Creek. Should residents have specific concern during a high rainfall event, they may call the local representative of the participating companies at 505-538-5220, NMED at 505-827-0078, or EPA at 1-800-533-3508.

### **Condition of the Road**

- 7) A commenter requested that the part of the Cleveland road that stretches from the cattle guard gate to the gate for the residents be regraded.

At the time Site removal activities began in September 1997, the road to the Cleveland Mill and Mine was in poor condition with numerous ruts, boulders, and areas where water would pool. After rain, the road became difficult to use because of the natural clays underlying the rock. So that the road would be passable during the clean-up, the participating companies improved the road by placing gravel on the road, grading it, and widening it. During inspection of the road in mid-July 1999, on several rainy days, EPA and the participating companies did not find any areas that are in worse condition than they were prior to the initiation of Site removal activities. The road remains in a greatly improved condition and will not be regraded.

### **Integrity of the Disposal Cell**

- 8) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) states that the Amended Proposed Plan was general in its description of the inspections for erosion and vegetative success, and the USFWS requested that either the Amended ROD or the Revised Reclamation and Revegetation Plan discuss in detail the manner in which vegetative restoration success will be evaluated. In addition, the USFWS requests that a plan be put in place to identify, repair and prevent damage to the disposal cell by small animals.

EPA agrees that the Amended ROD does not address the actions described by USFWS with great specificity. EPA agrees that these actions should be more thoroughly described in additional documentation. With respect to revegetation and erosion, EPA has taken the approach that the Site revegetation must be such that it maintains the effectiveness of the remedy, but that revegetation need not do more than maintain the effectiveness of the remedy. For this Site, one measure of effectiveness of the remedy is that the disposal cell cover stays intact. Another measure is that the amount of sediment eroded from the disposal cell cover and from the excavated areas does not cause an unacceptable amount of sediment to become suspended in the surface water. Currently, measurements are being taken of the amount of sediment in the sediment retention

structures. In addition, comparisons are being made between the total suspended solids in natural tributaries to Little Walnut Creek and the total suspended solids in areas where runoff from the Site is present. Numerical standards are a part of this performance standard. These standards are a part of the Site O&M Plan which is currently in draft and are also a part of the Site Revised Revegetation and Reclamation Plan.

EPA has agreed to give the participating companies two years (this two-year period began in fall 1998) to evaluate the success of the initial planting. During the months of July and August 1999, most of the reseeded areas (except those areas excavated to bedrock) showed signs of new growth. The cell area in particular had a new grass cover. If this success does not continue and an unacceptable amount of erosion is present, EPA can either compel the participating companies to add engineering controls, to seed the area again, or to do both.

EPA does not believe that small mammals will present a significant risk to the integrity of the disposal cell because the 10- to 15-foot-thick cover layer, along with the bedding layer, the geosynthetic layer and the protective layer, should be capable of preventing small mammals from causing a disturbance that would allow rainwater to infiltrate the cell. A large disturbance in the cover (for instance, if a colony of small mammals forms on the cell) would be identified during the periodic inspections. At that time, the regulating agencies will be consulted regarding a plan for restoration of the cover.

**Prepared for**  
**United States Environmental Protection Agency**

**Region 6**

**Administrative Record Index**

**Record of Decision  
Amendment Addendum**

**for**

**Cleveland Mill Superfund Site  
EPA ID No. NMD981155930**

**ESS VI  
Work Assignment No. ESS06014**

**Kathleen A. Aisling  
Remedial Project Manager  
U.S. EPA Region 6**

**Prepared by**

**TechLaw, Incorporated  
750 N. St. Paul Street, Suite 600  
Dallas, Texas 75201**

**October 5, 1999**

## INTRODUCTION

Section 113(j)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 42 U.S.C. Section 9613(j)(1), provides that judicial review of any issues concerning the adequacy of a response action shall be limited to the administrative record compiled for the site. CERCLA, as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to compile documents that form the basis for the selection of the remedial CERCLA and SARA response actions. These supporting documents form an "administrative record" (AR), which the Agency must provide for public review. The ARs are maintained at relevant EPA Regional Offices as well as "at or near the facility at issue."

The following Administrative Record Index was compiled in accordance with OSWER Directive Number 9833.3A-1, "Final Guidance on Administrative Records for Decisions on Selection of CERCLA Response Actions" (December 3, 1990). Documents listed as bibliography sources in response decision documents may not be listed in the AR Index. An index to the "Compendium of CERCLA Response Selection Guidance Documents" is enclosed in the AR. The AR Index file is compiled as documents related to the response action are being generated. All documents that are clearly relevant and nonprivileged are placed in the record file, entered into the index, and made available to the public as soon as possible. The documents included in the index are predominantly arranged in chronological order. EPA may send supplemental AR volumes and indexes to the designated repository. These supplements should be placed with the initial record file.

The AR Index helps readers locate and retrieve documents in the file. It also provides an overview of the response action history. The index includes the following information for each document:

- **AR Page No.** - The sequential numbers stamped on each page of the AR. The six digit numbers are located in the upper right corner of each page.
- **Document Date** - The date the document was published and/or released "01/01/3333" means no date was recorded.
- **No. of Pages** - Total number of printed pages in the document, including attachments.
- **Author** - Name, title and affiliation of author.
- **Recipient** - Name, title, and affiliation of the recipient.
- **Document Type** - General identification, e.g., Correspondence, report/study, etc.
- **Document Title** - Descriptive title or synopsis.

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX**

**FINAL 10/5/99**

**ROD AMENDMENT ADDENDUM**

000165

**Site Name:** NMD981155930 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**SSID:** 06G9 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**Oper Unit:** N/A

---

**Bates:** From: 000001 To: 000002  
**Date:** 06/09/1999  
**Pages:** 2  
**Title:** RESPONSE TO THE US EPA'S AMENDED PROPOSED PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE CLEVELAND MILL SUPERFUND SITE IN GRANT COUNTY, NEW MEXICO, DATED MAY 26, 1999  
**Doc Type:** CORRESPONDENCE  
**Author(s):**  
**Name:** FOWLER-PROPST, JENNIFER  
**Organization:** U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
**Job Title:** FIELD SUPERVISOR  
**Department(s):** FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
NEW MEXICO ECOLOGICAL SERVICES

**Recipient(s):**  
**Name:** STONEBARGER, NANCY  
**Organization:** U.S. EPA  
**Job Title:** N/A  
**Department(s):** REGION 6

---

**Bates:** From: 000003 To: 000046  
**Date:** 06/09/1999  
**Pages:** 44  
**Title:** TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENT PROCEEDINGS HELD ON JUNE 9, 1999 AT 7:00 PM, ROOM 110, LIGHT HALL AT WNMU, SILVER CITY, NEW MEXICO  
**Doc Type:** PUBLIC MEETING TRANSCRIPT  
**Author(s):**  
**Name:** ARRIETA, VANESSA  
**Organization:** FORD AND BROWN, INC  
**Job Title:** CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

**Recipient(s):**  
**Name:** N/A,  
**Organization:** U.S. EPA  
**Job Title:** N/A  
**Department(s):** REGION 6  
**Location(s):** SITE FILES

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX**

**FINAL 10/5/99**

**ROD AMENDMENT ADDENDUM**

Site Name: NMD981155930 - CLEVELAND MILL  
SSID: 06G9 - CLEVELAND MILL  
Oper Unit: N/A

---

Bates: 000047  
Date: 06/23/1999  
Pages: 1  
Title: PUBLIC NOTICE ON THE CLEVELAND MILL SUPERFUND SITE PROPOSED PLAN OF ACTION GRANT COUNTY, NEW MEXICO  
Doc Type: MEDIA CLIPPING  
Author(s):  
Name: N/A,  
Organization: LAS CRUCES SUN-NEWS  
Job Title: N/A

Recipient(s):  
Name: N/A,  
Organization: PUBLIC  
Job Title: N/A

---

Bates: From: 000048 To: 000049  
Date: 07/17/1999  
Pages: 2  
Title: NEWSPAPER ARTICLE ENTITLED LITTLE WALNUT CREEK RECLAIMED, WITH PHOTOS  
Doc Type: MEDIA CLIPPING  
Author(s):  
Name: N/A,  
Organization: SILVER CITY SUN NEWS  
Job Title: N/A

Recipient(s):  
Name: N/A,  
Organization: PUBLIC  
Job Title: N/A

---

Bates: 000050  
Date: 07/17/1999  
Pages: 1  
Title: NEWSPAPER PHOTO TITLED CLEANUP CELEBRATED, PICTURED ARE KATHLEEN AISLING, RPM FOR US EPA REGION 6 AND BOB KING, WATER RESOURCE SPECIALIST FOR NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT  
Doc Type: MEDIA CLIPPING  
Author(s):  
Name: N/A,  
Organization: SILVER CITY DAILY PRESS  
Job Title: N/A

Recipient(s):  
Name: N/A,  
Organization: PUBLIC  
Job Title: N/A

000166

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX**

**FINAL 10/5/99**

**ROD AMENDMENT ADDENDUM**

000167

**Site Name:** NMD981155930 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**SSID:** 06G9 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**Oper Unit:** N/A

---

**Bates:** From: 000051 To: 000082  
**Date:** 07/29/1999  
**Pages:** 32  
**Title:** CLEVELAND MILL SITE - SECOND QUARTER 1999 PROGRESS REPORT  
**Doc Type:** CORRESPONDENCE  
**Doc Type:** REPORT/STUDY

**Author(s):**

**Name:** MEYER, WENDY A  
**Organization:** ADRIAN BROWN CONSULTANTS, INC  
**JobTitle:** REMOVAL ACTION SITE MANAGER

**Recipient(s):**

**Name:** AISLING, KATHLEEN A  
**Organization:** U.S. EPA  
**JobTitle:** REMEDIAL PROJECT MANAGER  
**Department(s):** REGION 6

---

**Bates:** From: 000083 To: 000092  
**Date:** 08/10/1999  
**Pages:** 10  
**Title:** DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS  
**Doc Type:** DEED/LEASE

**Author(s):**

**Name:** BARKER, GARY L  
**Organization:** BAYARD MINING CORPORATION  
**JobTitle:** PRESIDENT

**Recipient(s):**

**Name:** N/A,  
**Organization:** U.S. EPA  
**JobTitle:** N/A  
**Department(s):** REGION 6  
**Location(s):** SITE FILES

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX**

**FINAL 10/5/99**

**ROD AMENDMENT ADDENDUM**

**Site Name:** NMD981155930 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**SSID:** 06G9 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**Oper Unit:** N/A

---

000168

**Bates:** 000093  
**Date:** 09/09/1999  
**Pages:** 1  
**Title:** AMENDED ROD FOR THE CLEVELAND MILL SITE NEAR SILVER CITY, NEW MEXICO  
**Doc Type:** CORRESPONDENCE

**Author(s):**

**Name:** LEWIS, GREG  
**Organization:** STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
**Job Title:** DIRECTOR  
**Department(s):**  
ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT  
GROUND WATER QUALITY BUREAU  
WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION

**Recipient(s):**

**Name:** KNUDSON, P.E., MYRON O  
**Organization:** U.S. EPA  
**Job Title:** DIRECTOR  
**Department(s):**  
REGION 6  
SUPERFUND DIVISION

---

**Bates:** From: 000094 To: 000123  
**Date:** 09/20/1999  
**Pages:** 30  
**Title:** AMENDED RECORD OF DECISION  
**Doc Type:** RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

**Author(s):**

**Name:** KNUDSON, P.E., MYRON O  
**Organization:** U.S. EPA  
**Job Title:** DIRECTOR  
**Department(s):**  
REGION 6  
SUPERFUND DIVISION

**Recipient(s):**

**Name:** N/A  
**Organization:** U.S. EPA  
**Job Title:** N/A  
**Department(s):**  
REGION 6  
**Location(s):**  
SITE FILES

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX**

**FINAL 10/5/99**

**ROD AMENDMENT ADDENDUM**

**Site Name:** NMD981155930 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**SSID:** 06G9 - CLEVELAND MILL  
**Oper Unit:** N/A

---

000169

**Bates:**           **From:** 000124           **To:** 000130

**Date:**           10/05/1999

**Pages:**           7

**Title**            **RECORD OF DECISION AMENDMENT ADDENDUM ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD INDEX**

**Doc Type:**       **OUTLINE**

**Author(s):**

**Name:**            N/A,  
**Organization:**   TECHLAW INCORPORATED  
**JobTitle:**        N/A

**Recipient(s):**

**Name:**            N/A,  
**Organization:**   U.S. EPA  
**JobTitle:**        N/A  
  
**Department(s)**  
**REGION 6**  
  
**Location(s)**  
**SITE FILES**